

DRAFT: COMMUNITY MEETINGS

Community Input Meetings

Two community input meetings were held to invite residents to help develop a plan to reduce Mountain View's waste, increase recycling and manage trash. The PowerPoint presentation slides and other background information, and results of the small group discussion at the second meeting can be found on the City's Zero Waste page at www.mvrecycle.org.

Meeting 1 - April 21, 2011

Approximately 20 people attended and heard a presentation that addressed the following topics:

- Background
- What is Zero Waste?
- Draft Zero Waste vision and goals
- Milestones for developing the Plan
- Zero Waste in Mountain View

Participant Questions: A total of 16 questions were answered related to the diversion of compostable materials at the SMaRT Station[®], the City's commercial food scrap composting pilot, construction and demolition materials reuse, space for recycling and composting carts, whether the 2015 and 2020 interim goals are realistic, the sharing of trash containers, and what the City is doing for Extended Producer Responsibility.

Participant Comments:

- Thank you to the City Council for the Green Building Ordinance.
- Get support from cities to open a used building supply "ReStore".
- Provide yard trimmings collection service for condominiums.
- Provide compost bins.
- Ban use of plastic bags.
- Ban Styrofoam.
- Provide/support appliance repair services.
- Aim to recover more organics than fines at the SMaRT Station.
- Promote/provide more details about the On-Call Cleanups: times/year, residential only.
- Appreciate that garbage is sorted for recoverables, but hope that there is more potential for organics recovery.
- Support Mountain View joining Palo Alto in an effort to develop anaerobic digestion for generating renewable energy and revenues.

DRAFT: COMMUNITY MEETINGS

Meeting 2 – August 30, 2011

Approximately twelve people attended and heard a presentation that addressed the following topics:

- What is Zero Waste?
- What will it mean to get to Zero Waste?
- Relative costs/benefits for key service options
- Role key service options play in reaching Zero Waste?

Participant Questions: Several questions were answered related to the definition of problem materials, the methodology used for the on-route recycling and yard trimmings participation survey, what “added recyclables” option entails, and the definition of “universal recycling”.

Small Group Discussion: Following the opening presentation, attendees were invited to join in small group discussions to provide input on 4 questions related to interest in weekly services, options for food scraps diversion, willingness to pay for new services, and support for city ordinances banning problem materials.

1. Knowing what you learned about estimated diversion and costs, how interested are you in the City pursuing?

- a. Weekly recycling: 6 of 8
- b. Weekly yard trimmings: 5 of 8

Participant Comments:

- All Zero Waste programs should be compared in terms of overall sustainability.
- Weekly collection may increase scavenging of recyclables set out for collection.
- A second cart is helpful to handle volume.

2. Knowing what you learned about diversion and costs, how would you rank the following food scraps program options?

Total Number of “Votes”:

	#1 Choice	#2 Choice
a. Promote backyard composting/offer discounted bins	1	0
b. Add curbside collection of food scraps/compostable paper	4	3
c. Increase food scraps/compostable paper recovery at SMaRT	3	5

Participant Comments:

- Backyard composting is difficult to do properly and is not applicable to the broader community (not very many are willing to do it).

DRAFT: COMMUNITY MEETINGS

- For backyard composting it's important to keep in mind that only about 1/3 of Mountain View residents live in single-family residences. Multi-family dwellings and townhouses typically do not have extensive landscaping or gardens, and/or use professional landscaping services.
- Diversion results from home composting are difficult to quantify.
- There may be trade-offs between convenience and the financial and environmental costs of added collection. Curbside collection increases costs and transportation, but more materials may be collected avoiding landfill disposal and associated GHG emissions.
- It is difficult to educate residents in multi-family dwellings and they are not as aware of how to recycle and where to place recyclables for collection.
- It appears the increased recovery at SMaRT option is the least cost with the least GHG emissions impacts on a citywide basis. However, from an individual perspective, would prefer the convenience of simply adding food scraps to the yard debris cart.
- SMaRT processing avoids any individual responsibility.

3. Zero Waste programs like weekly recycling, weekly yard trimmings/food scraps collection, and additional recyclables will cost more. What is your bottom-line for how much more you are willing to pay per month?

- a. \$2/ month: 0
- b. \$3/ month: 1
- c. \$5/ month: 7
- d. None: 0

4. Would you support a City ordinance banning the use of the following products?

- a. Single-use plastic bags? Yes: 8 No: 0
- b. Polystyrene take-out food packaging (Styrofoam)? Yes: 8 No: 0

Attendees were offered the opportunity to complete either the Single-family or Multi-family survey as appropriate. These results will be compiled separately in order to compare the results of those electing to come to the Community Meeting and have the opportunity to learn and discuss more information about the issues, with the results of randomly selected survey respondents.